To: Technology Center 2100
Facsimile Number: 703-872-9306

Total Pages Sent: 7

From: Carlton H. Hoel
Texas Instruments Incorporated
Facsimile: 972-917-4418
Phone: 972-917-4365

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Phillip Thrift et al.
Serial No: 09/770,039
Filed: 1/25/2001
Art Unit: 2126
Examiner: L. Zhen
Docket No.: TI-29973
Conf. No.: 5611
Customer No.: 23494

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 703-872-9306 on the date shown below:

Gracia Sansom 6-01-05
Gracia Sansom Date

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

X FACSIMILE COVER SHEET (1 SHEET)	___ AMENDMENT
___ NEW APPLICATION	___ EOT
___ DECLARATION	___ NOTICE OF APPEAL
___ ASSIGNMENT	X APPEAL (6 Pages)
___ FORMAL DRAWINGS	___ ISSUE FEE
___ INFORMAL DRAWINGS	___ REPLY BRIEF (IN TRIPLICATE)
___ CONTINUATION APP'N	___
___ DIVISIONAL APP'N	

NAME OF INVENTOR(S): Phillip Thrift et al.	RECEIPT DATE & SERIAL NO.: **Serial No.: 09/770,039**
TITLE OF INVENTION: Media Framework Systems	**Filing Date: 1/25/2001**
TI FILE NO.: **TI-29973** / DEPOSIT ACCT. NO.: **20-0668**	**Conf. No.: 5611**
FAXED: **06/01/2005**	
DUE: **06/01/2005**	
ATTY/SEC'Y: **CHH/gs**	

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 0 1 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appl.No.:	09/770,039	Confirmation No.: 5611
Appellant:	Thrift et al	
Filed:	January 25, 2001	
TC/AU:	2126	
Examiner:	Zhen	
Docket:	TI-29973	
Cust.No.:	23494	

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The attached sheets contain the Rule 41.37 items of appellants' brief. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee for filing a brief in support of the appeal plus any other necessary fees to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(i) Real party of interest

Texas Instruments Incorporated owns the application.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(ii) Related appeals and interferences

There are no related dispositive appeals or interferences.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(iii) Status of claims

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application with all claims finally rejected. This appeal involves the finally rejected claims.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(iv) Status of amendments

There is no amendment after final rejection.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(v) Summary of claimed subject matter

The invention provides a combination of a general purpose processor (GPP) which can run an application on a media framework with a digital signal processor (DSP) which can run algorithms on a DSP framework so that the application can use plug-ins which correspond to algorithms and which extend the media framework and thereby send data to the DSP framework, have the algorithms process the data, and retrieve the processed data from the DSP framework. Fig. 1 illustrates the combination with the GPP, application, and media framework JMF 2.0 (Java Media Framework) on the left and with the DSP, algorithms (audio-visual codecs), and the DSP framework on the right. Patent application pages 3-4 summarize the GPP-DSP combination system.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(vi) Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are:

(1) claims 1-3 were rejected as unpatentable over the Brooks reference in view of the Frankel reference.

(2) claim 4 was rejected as unpatentable over the Frankel reference in view of the Kramer reference.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(vii) Arguments

(1) Claims 1-3 were rejected as unpatentable over Brooks in view of Frankel.

As to claim 1, the Examiner cited Brooks Fig.2 and columns 5 and 7-8 for all of the elements of claim 1 except the second framework of element (d); Frankel was added to Brooks to show a framework on the DSP in a system with a GPP.

Appellants reply that the Examiner identified Brooks Fig.2 Application 60 as element (c) of claim 1; but Application 60 does not include the required media framework (e.g., JMF 2.0). A framework is an application programming interface (API), not just an application program as cited by the Examiner. Indeed, patent application Fig.1 shows the GPP with an operating system (OS) and a media framework (JMF 2.0) which together with the extensions would be the first software system of claim 1, element (c); an application program (Application and Media Players) together with the plug-ins (iDSP Plugins) would be separate items. The GPP of Brooks (Host CPU 10 in Fig.1) is only briefly described at column 5, lines 34-52 and has no suggestion of anything beyond an Apple Macintosh operating system.

Further, Frankel (Figs.1-2) shows a GPP with an operating system (DOS) coupled through a bus to a DSP with an operating system (DSP operating system); however, neither the GPP nor the DSP of Frankel has a framework. As already noted, patent application Fig.1 shows a framework (JMF 2.0) and operating system (OS) on the GPP and a framework (iDSP Framework) and operating system (RTOS) on the DSP; JMF 2.0 and the OS plus extensions would be the first software system of claim 1 element (c) and the iDSP Framework and RTOS would be the second software system of claim 1 element (d). In contrast, Frankel only shows operating systems.

Lastly, Brooks Fig.2 Plug-ins 40, 42, and 44 have direct control of DSP resources (col.7, ln.30-32; col.6, ln.65-col.7, ln.3); so there would be no

suggestion of adding even the DSP operating system of Frankel to the DSPs of Brooks.

With regard to dependent claims 2-3, appellants reply upon the patentability of parent claim 1.

(2) Claim 4 was rejected as unpatentable over Frankel in view of Kramer; the Examiner cited Frankel for all of the steps of claim 4 except for the message designation of a third buffer in the second software system; the Examiner added Kramer to show buffers.

Appellants reply that step (h) of claim 4 requires designation of a third buffer, and buffer swapping in Frankel (col.10, ln. 5-10) does not suggest the need for a third buffer. The jitter buffer in Kramer is not a message designated buffer but always the same buffer, so Kramer also does not suggest step (h) of claim 4. And the combination likewise does not suggest a message-designated third buffer.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(viii) Claims appendix

1. A system, comprising:

(a) a general purpose processor;

(b) a digital signal processor coupled to said general purpose processor;

(c) a first software system operating on said general purpose processor, said first software system including a media framework with a first interface for a plug-in;

(d) a second software system operating on said digital signal processor, said second software system including a second framework with a second interface for a plug-in;

(e) said first and second software systems each containing portions forming a communication bridge coupling said first and second software systems; and

(f) an extending interface in said first software system, said extending interface coupling to said second framework.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein:

(a) said second framework includes a resource manager which registers a plug-in to said second plug-in interface.

3. The system of claim 2, wherein:

(a) said plug-in is a media codec.

4. A method of processing media streams, comprising:

(a) providing host processor with a first software system;

(b) providing a digital signal processor with a second software system and coupled to said host processor and first software system;

(c) providing an host application coupled to said first software system and a signal processing application coupled to said second software system;

(d) transfer a first data frame from said first software system to a first buffer of said second software system;

(e) send a message from said first software system to said signal processing application;

(f) send a message from said signal processing application to said first software system designating a second buffer in said second software system for a second data frame plus said signal processing application processes said first data frame;

(g) transfer a second data frame from said first software system to said second buffer of said second software system;

(h) send a message from said signal processing application to said first software system designating a third buffer in said second software system and containing said first data after processing;

(i) said first software system provides said first data frame after processing to said host application; and

(j) repeat steps (d)-(i) for subsequent data frames and buffers.

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(ix) Evidence appendix

n/a

Rule 41.37(c)(1)(x) Related proceedings appendix

n/a